DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 069 UD 010 301

AUTHOR Dispenzieri, Angelo; And Others
TITLE Characteristics of SEEK Program Students: September 1968 Entering Class.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Research and Evaluation Unit for Special Programs.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 69
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.55
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen, College Programs, Compensatory Education, *Compensatory Education Programs, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Higher Education, High School Graduates, Negro Students, Puerto Ricans, Spanish Speaking, *Student Characteristics, Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS City University Of New York, New York, *Search For Education Elevations And Knowledge, SEEK

ABSTRACT

A study was made of the characteristics of the 1,169 students from poverty areas in New York City who in September 1968 entered the Search for Education Elevation and Knowledge Program. Of the entrants nearly one-third enrolled at University Center, approximately one-fourth at Brooklyn College, and almost one-fifth at City College. Hunter, Lehman, and Queens Colleges admitted approximately 10 per cent or less; York College admitted three per cent. Sixty per cent were Negroes born in the U.S.A.; more than one-fourth were Puerto Rican; and six per cent were native-born whites. The remaining ten per cent were foreign-born students. More than half of the class were females. However, American- and foreign-born Negroes had a female majority. Puerto Rican entrants were evenly divided and all other groups had more than 60 per cent males. Forty-three per cent had high school academic diplomas and 30 per cent had general diplomas. Of the remainder, 15 per cent had vocational, eight per cent commercial, three per cent equivalency, and one per cent technical diplomas. The entire class had an average high school average of 74. (JM)

ED041069

CHARACTERISTICS OF SEEK PROGRAM STUDENTS: SEPTEMBER 1968 ENTERING CLASS

by

ANGELO DISPENZIERI
Director of Research (to 7/31/69)

and

SEYMOUR GINIGER
Acting Director of Research

YVONNE M. TORMES
Research Associate

JERRY CHASE
Research Assistant

STANLEY BERNKNOPF
Research Assistant

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD010301

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION UNIT

September 1, 1969

ED041069

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present report provides descriptive data on students who entered the SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge) Program in the Fall of 1968. It is one of a continuing series of reports on students in special programs of the City University of New York which will be useful for future program planning and decision-making.

We are grateful to Chancellor Albert Bowker for providing the opportunity to conduct the research. We also appreciate the continuous support of Vice-Chancellor T. Edward Hollander and Vice-Chancellor Julius C. C. Edelstein. The assistance of Jonah Hochstadt, Research Assistant, and the secretarial staff--Iris Kirschner, Jane Policastro, Arlette Elkaim and Maria Lepani--is also acknowledged.

Professor Dispenzieri, presently Dean of the Evening and Extension Division of Baruch College, conceived the research study as well as participated in the original data gathering and has been presently serving as design and editorial consultant. He has not lost his interest in the Research and Evaluation Unit despite his new and time-consuming activities as Dean of the Evening Session at Baruch.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		i
LIST OF TABLES		iii
SUMMARY		vi
SECTION I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. The Program	1
	B. Eligibility Requirements and Selection of Students: 1968	2
	C. Senior College Placement	4
SECTION II.	ETHNIC AND SEX DISTRIBUTION OF SEEK PROGRAM STUDENTS: SEPTEMBER 1968 ENTERING CLASS	4
	A. Ethnic and Sex Distribution in the Total Class	4
	B. Ethnic and Sex Distribution in Each Senior College	5
SECTION III.	HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS AND HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES OF SEEK PROGRAM STUDENTS: SEPTEMBER 1968 ENTERING CLASS	10

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Sex and Ethnic Distribution of 1968 Entering Class (Day and Evening)	12
2	Comparison Between Sex Distribution of Negroes And of All Other Ethnic Groups of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	13
3	Sex and Ethnic Distribution of 1968 Entering Class at Brooklyn College (Day)	14
4	Sex and Ethnic Distribution of 1968 Entering Class at City College	15
5	Sex and Ethnic Distribution of 1968 Entering Class at Hunter College	16
6	Sex and Ethnic Distribution of 1968 Entering Class at Lehman College (Day)	17
7	Sex and Ethnic Distribution of 1968 Entering Class at Queens College (Day)	18
8	Sex and Ethnic Distribution of 1968 Entering Class at University Center	19
9	Sex and Ethnic Distribution of 1968 Entering Class at York College	20
10	Ethnic Distribution at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day and Evening)	21
11	Distribution of USA-Born Negroes Compared With That of All Other Ethnic Groups at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	22

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
12	Chi Square Values for Comparisons Between USA-Born Negroes And All Other Ethnic Groups at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	23
13	Distribution of Puerto Ricans Compared With All Other Ethnic Groups at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	24
14	Chi Square Values for Comparisons of Puerto Ricans With All Other Ethnic Groups at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	25
15	Distribution of USA-Born White Compared With All Other Ethnic Groups at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	26
16	Chi Square Values for Comparisons of USA Born Whites With All Other Ethnic Groups at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	27
17	Sex Distribution at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day and Evening)	28
18	Chi Square Values for Comparisons Between Sex Distributions at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day and Evening Combined)	29
19	Sex Distribution of USA-Born Negroes at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	30
20	Chi Square Values for Comparisons Between Sex Distributions of USA-Born Negroes at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	31

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
21	Sex Distribution of Puerto Ricans at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	32
22	Chi Square Values for Comparisons Between Sex Distributions of Puerto Ricans at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	33
23	Sex Distribution of USA-Born Whites at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	34
24	High School Diploma and High School Average of Students at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	35
25	Academic High School Diplomas Compared With All Other High School Diplomas at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	36
26	Mean Academic High School Averages for Students With Academic Diplomas at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day) and One-Way Analysis of Variance Among Colleges	37
27	Mean Academic High School Averages for Students With General Diplomas at Each Senior College (Day) and One-Way Analysis of Variance Among Colleges	38
28	Mean Academic High School Averages for Students Holding Academic Diplomas Compared With Those of Students Holding All Other Diplomas at Each Senior College of 1968 Entering Class (Day)	39

CHARACTERISTICS OF SEEK PROGRAM STUDENTS:
SEPTEMBER 1968 ENTERING CLASS

SUMMARY

In September 1968, 1,169 students from poverty areas in the five boroughs of New York City entered the SEEK Program. They registered at the six senior colleges of The City University of New York and at University Center.

Nearly one-third of the entrants enrolled at University Center. Brooklyn College had approximately one-fourth and City College had almost one-fifth of the total group. Each of the other colleges (Hunter, Lehman, Queens, and York) admitted approximately 10% or less of the students, York having the lowest number of admissions (3%).

Sixty percent of the students were Negroes born in the United States; more than one-fourth were Puerto Rican; and six percent were native-born whites. The remaining ten percent were foreign-born students from Central and South America, Europe, and Asia.

More than half of the class were females. However, USA-and foreign-born Negroes had a female majority. Puerto Rican entrants were evenly divided between the two sexes and all other groups had more than sixty percent males.

The proportions of native-born Negroes at University Center and Hunter were lower than at other schools while the

latter two colleges and York had higher proportions of Puerto Ricans than the other schools. Brooklyn had the highest proportion of native-born whites, whereas York had none.

Fewer men than women were enrolled at Brooklyn, Hunter, Lehman, and Queens. The other three colleges had nearly equal ratios of males to females.

Among USA-born Negroes, the majority of students were female at every college, Hunter and York enrolling three times as many Negroe females than males. Among Puerto Ricans, the ratio of males to females ranged from 1:4 at Brooklyn to 4:1 at York. Among native-born whites, the sex ratios varied among the colleges, but the overall differences were not significant.

Forty-three percent of all admitted students had high school academic diplomas and 30% had general diplomas. The remainder had vocational (15%), commercial (8%), equivalency (3%), and technical (1%) diplomas.

The schools differed in the ratio of academic to non-academic diploma students. Lehman received the highest percentage of academic diploma students (75%), followed by Queens and York (59% each). Academic diploma students at the other schools accounted for less than 50% of their admissions, University Center being by far the lowest (32%).

The students' high school averages were generally homogeneous among the colleges, ranging from 73 at York to 75 at Brooklyn. The entire 1968 class had an average of 74.

High school averages for students within each type of diploma category were also homogeneous, except for those with equivalency diplomas who had a lower mean average (67) than the others (ranging from 73 to 76).

CHARACTERISTICS OF SEEK PROGRAM STUDENTS: SEPTEMBER 1968 ENTERING CLASS

1. Introduction

A. The Program

The SEEK Program (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge), which began at City College of The City University of New York in 1965, is designed to provide higher education to students with potential who, because of economic deprivation and lack of opportunity, have not been able to compete effectively for admission to the City University on a regular basis. It is assumed that with intensive counseling, additional scholatic help, remedial courses, tutoring and financial assistance, students whose poverty contributed to their failure to do well in high school can successfully complete college.

In September, 1968, 1,169 students entered City University through the SEEK Program. They were enrolled at the six senior colleges in the system (Brooklyn, City, Hunter, Lehman, Queens, and York) and at University Center which offers dormitory facilities and courses for SEEK students in their first two years of college.

This report describes eligibility and selection criteria used in 1968, and presents some characteristics of the 1968

entering class, including ethnic and sex distributions at each college, types of diplomas and high school averages.

B. Eligibility Requirements and Selection of Students: 1968

Applications were solicited from high schools and community agencies.

To be eligible, applicants had to be high school graduates or have equivalency diplomas, and be under thirty years of age at the beginning of the semester. They could not have previously attended college nor could they be eligible for matriculation in the City University system. In addition, applicants had to be citizens of the United States (or present a Declaration of Intention) and must have lived in New York City for at least one year. If a candidate did not meet the residence requirement, he could still be eligible if he was under 21 and his parents or guardians had lived in New York City for at least one year. Finally, no one could be admitted to SEEK who did not live in an officially designated poverty area. These areas, as defined by the Council Against Poverty, include most of Manhattan, approximately half of Brooklyn and the Bronx, and smaller "pockets" in Queens and Staten Island. Applicants who lived outside these poverty areas could be considered for admission to the College Discovery

Program (another City University special program for the educationally disadvantaged), provided they met certain financial deprivation criteria.

In the Fall semester of 1968, all students who met the eligibility criteria and had high school averages of 70 or more or had scored 240 or higher on the General Equivalency Test were accepted. Since some seats were still available, applicants with high school averages of 69 were accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. After registration, vacant spots created by students who were accepted but did not enroll were filled with previously rejected applicants.

One thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine applicants were accepted; of these, 620 (35%) did not enter the program, leaving 1,169 students who registered for day and evening classes at the seven colleges.

Approximately three-fourths of those who registered had been high school seniors the preceding Spring. Most of the remainder had graduated from high school after 1963, but a few (3%) had been out of high school for more than nine years.

More than two-thirds of the class had been referred to the program through their high schools. About one-third had been referred through community agencies.

C. Senior College Placement

College assignment was made on the basis of the student's own preference. If the college of his first choice was full, an attempt was made to assign him to his second choice, and so on.

II. Ethnic and Sex Distribution of SEEK Program Students September 1968 Entering Class

A. Ethnic and Sex Distribution in the Total Class

The number and percentage of students in each ethnic category represented at the Senior Colleges for the 1968 SEEK entering class are shown in Table 1, as well as the number and percentage of men and women in each ethnic category.

Nearly 60% of the students were Negroes born in the United States. Foreign-born Negroes accounted for only four percent of the total population.[1]

One-fourth of the population was Puerto Rican (either the student or his parents were born in Puerto Rico). Another three percent came from Spanish-speaking families other than Puerto Rican (either the student or his parents were born in a Latin American country or Spain).[2] For students

---

[1] The countries of origin, in order of frequency, are: Jamaica, Haiti, British West Indies (unspecified), Virgin Islands, Barbados, British Honduras, British Guiana, Panama, England.

[2] The countries of origin, in order of frequency, are: Cuba, Dominican Republic, Panama, Brazil, Columbia, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, San Salvador, Spain.

classified as Puerto Rican or Spanish-speaking, no subdivision on the basis of skin color or country of birth was made.

Seven percent of the entrants were white, most of them (6%) native-born with the rest born in Europe and the Middle East.[3] The rest of the students (1%) were Asian, all of Chinese origin.

While there were more females (56%) than males (44%) in the total population, among ethnic categories, only Negroes had more female than male admissions in both native-born (61% female) and foreign-born (68% female) groups. Among Puerto Ricans, the male-female ratio was almost 1:1. All other ethnic categories included more males (at least 60%) than females (40% or less). Table 2 indicates that the sex distribution among Negroes (including USA-and foreign-born) was significantly different from that of all other ethnic categories combined.

B. Ethnic and Sex Distribution in Each Senior College

Tables 3 to 9 present the ethnic and sex distribution for the 1968 entering class at each senior college participating in the program. Table 10 summarizes the ethnic distribution

---

[3]The countries of origin, in order of frequency, are: Greece, Germany, Israel, Italy, Poland.

at each senior college among students enrolled during the day and evening sessions.

There were variations among the colleges in the ethnic composition of the day sessions for the 1968 entering class. City, Lehman, Queens, and York had the highest proportions of native-born Negroes in their populations (approximately two-thirds) as contrasted with Brooklyn (59%), University Center (50%), and Hunter (49%). Hunter, University Center, and York had higher proportions of Puerto Ricans (approximately one-third) than the other colleges (ranging from 15% to 18%). Native-born whites ranged from none at York to 12% at Brooklyn. All other ethnic groups constituted 11% of the day admissions at Brooklyn and Lehman, 10% at Queens, 9% at City and Hunter, and 7% at University Center and York.

Evening session students are not discussed since there were too few (4 at Brooklyn, 12 at Lehman, and 4 at Queens) for a meaningful discussion.

In order to determine whether the variations observed in the ethnic distributions among the colleges were significantly different, chi square tests of significance[4] were

---

[4]The chi square statistical test permits evaluation of whether observed differences between independent groups differ from those that might be expected by chance.

conducted to compare each of the major ethnic groups with all the other ethnic categories combined (Tables 11, 13, 15). In order to locate specific differences, individual chi squares were also computed comparing the distribution of each major ethnic group to that of all the other ethnic categories in each college versus every other college (Tables 12, 14, 16).

University Center differed significantly in the distribution of native-born Negroes (50%) from Brooklyn (59%), City (69%), Lehman (67%), and Queens (67%). See Tables 11 and 12. Hunter, where the distribution of Negroes (49%) approximated that at University Center, differed significantly from City, Lehman, and Queens. In addition, Brooklyn differed significantly from City.

The proportion of Puerto Ricans was significantly higher at Hunter (35%) and at University Center (40%) than at Brooklyn (18%), City (16%), Lehman (15%), or Queens (18%). Puerto Ricans also represented a significantly higher proportion of students at York (31%) than at City. See Tables 13 and 14. Brooklyn had significantly more native-born whites (12%) than City (6%), Queens (5%), or University Center (3%). See Tables 15 and 16.

The male-female proportions at each school are shown in Table 17. Among students enrolled during the day and evening, female admissions were found to be more numerous than males at Brooklyn (58% vs. 42%), Hunter (73% vs. 27%), Lehman (61% vs. 39%), and Queens (62% vs. 38%). At City, University Center and York the male-female proportions were nearly equally divided. A statistical test indicated that the relative proportions of each sex differed among schools (Table 17). Specific between school differences (Table 18) were found in comparing Hunter with Brooklyn, City, University Center and York. In addition, City differed significantly from Brooklyn and Queens. University Center also differed from Queens.

Comparisons were also made of the male-female ratio among senior colleges for each major ethnic category (Table 19). Among native-born Negroes, the ratio of males to females was 2:3. Although all the schools had a majority of Negro females vs. Negro males, there was a significant difference in the sex ratios among the schools. The ratio of Negro males to females was lowest at Hunter and York (1:3), followed by Lehman and Queens (1:2), Brooklyn and University Center (2:3), and City (1:1). Table 20 shows that Hunter's sex distribution for Negroes differed significantly from that of Brooklyn

and University Center. In addition, Queens differed significantly from City.

Significant variations were also found in the male-female ratios among Puerto Rican students at the various colleges (Table 21). Fewer men than women were found at Brooklyn (1:4), Hunter (approximately 1:2), Lehman and Queens (3:4). However, reversals were found at City (2:1), University Center (3:2) and York (4:1), all of which had more men than women. Table 22 shows that the sex distribution among Puerto Rican students at Brooklyn differed significantly from that of City, University Center, and York. Further, Hunter differed significantly from City, University Center and York.

Among native-born whites, the sex ratios varied among the colleges, but the differences were not statistically significant (Table 23). There were more males than females at Brooklyn (approximately 3:1), University Center (5:1) and Lehman (2:1). Queens had an equal ratio of males to females (1:1), whereas City (6:7) and Hunter (3:4) had slightly more females than males.

III. High School Diplomas and High School Averages of SEEK Program Students: September 1968 Entering Class.

Table 24 reports the distribution of the types of High School diplomas earned by the students at each college in the 1968 class, and the mean high school averages for each type of diploma at each college.

Of the 1,141 day session admissions, 43% had academic diplomas and 30% had general diplomas. Vocational diplomas were held by 15% of the class, commercial diplomas by 8%, and the remaining students had equivalency (3%) or technical (1%) diplomas.

The schools differed in the ratios of academic to non-academic diplomas held by their students (Table 25). Lehman received the highest percentage of academic diploma students (75%), followed by Queens and York (59% each). At the other schools, academic diplomas accounted for less than 50% of admissions, with University Center being by far the lowest (32%).

High school averages among students admitted to the colleges were generally homogeneous, ranging from 73 at York to 75 at Brooklyn. The entire 1968 class had an average of 74.

Averages for each type of diploma were also homogeneous, except that those who held equivalency diplomas had a lower mean high school average (67) than the others (range 73 to 76).

The range of averages for academic diploma students at each school was extremely small, with Brooklyn showing the highest mean (76) and York the lowest (73). As might be expected of such a small range of scores, an analysis of variance of mean averages among the seven schools did not yield any significant results (Table 26).

No significant results were obtained, either, when the mean high school averages for students with general diplomas were compared among schools (Table 27). Variations were very slight, with Lehman showing the highest mean (76) and York the lowest (72).

A comparison was also made of the mean high school average of students with academic diplomas vs. students with non-academic diplomas at each school (Table 28). At each school, the mean high school average of students holding academic diplomas was generally similar to that of students holding other types of diplomas.

TABLE 1

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
(DAY AND EVENING)

Ethnic Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA-born)	267	38.9	419	61.1	686	58.7
Puerto Rican (USA- or PR-born)	152	50.5	149	49.5	301	25.8
White (USA-born)	48	64.9	26	35.1	74	6.3
Other Spanish-speaking	20	60.6	13	39.4	33	2.8
Foreign-born Negro	15	31.9	32	68.1	47	4.0
Foreign-born White	9	69.2	4	30.8	13	1.1
Asian	9	60.0	6	40.0	15	1.3
T O T A L	520	44.5	649	55.5	1,169	100.0

TABLE 2

COMPARISON BETWEEN SEX DISTRIBUTION OF NEGROES
AND OF ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS
IN 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Negro (USA-born & Foreign-born)	279	39.3	431	60.7	710
All Others	234	54.3	197	45.7	431
TOTAL	513	45.0	628	55.0	1,141

$$\underline{x}^2 = 24.38$$
$$\underline{df} = 1$$
$$\underline{p} < .001$$

TABLE 3

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE (DAY)

Ethnic Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA-born)	66	41.2	94	58.8	160	58.8
Puerto Rican (USA- or PR-born)	10	20.0	40	80.0	50	18.3
White (USA-born)	23	71.8	9	28.1	32	11.8
Other Spanish-speaking	4	57.1	3	42.9	7	2.6
Foreign-born Negro	6	35.3	11	64.7	17	6.3
Foreign-born White	2	100.0	--	0.0	2	0.7
Asian	4	100.0	--	0.0	4	1.5
T O T A L	115	42.3	157	57.7	272	100.0

TABLE 4

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
AT CITY COLLEGE

Ethnic Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA-born)	71	48.6	75	51.4	146	68.9
Puerto Rican (USA- or PR-born)	22	64.7	12	35.3	34	16.0
White (USA-born)	6	46.2	7	53.8	13	6.1
Other Spanish-speaking	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	2.4
Foreign-born Negro	3	37.5	5	62.5	8	3.8
Foreign-born White	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	1.4
Asian	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	1.4
T O T A L	108	50.9	104	49.1	212	100.0

TABLE 5

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
AT HUNTER COLLEGE

Ethnic Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA-born)	10	22.2	35	77.8	45	48.9
Puerto Rican (USA- or PR-born)	10	31.3	22	68.8	32	34.8
White (USA-born)	3	42.9	4	57.1	7	7.6
Other Spanish-speaking	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	3.3
Foreign-born Negro	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	4.3
Foreign-born White	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Asian	--	0.0	1	100.0	1	1.1
T O T A L	25	27.2	67	72.8	92	100.0

TABLE 6

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
AT LEHMAN COLLEGE (DAY)

Ethnic Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA-born)	10	32.3	21	67.7	31	67.4
Puerto Rican (USA- or PR-born)	3	42.9	4	57.1	7	15.3
White (USA-born)	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	6.5
Other Spanish-speaking	2	100.0	--	0.0	2	4.3
Foreign-born Negro	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Foreign-born White	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	4.3
Asian	1	100.0	--	0.0	1	2.2
T O T A L	19	41.3	27	58.7	46	100.0

TABLE 7

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
AT QUEENS COLLEGE (DAY)

Ethnic Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA-born)	29	33.7	57	66.3	86	67.2
Puerto Rican (USA- or PR-born)	10	43.5	13	56.5	23	18.0
White (USA-born)	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	4.7
Other Spanish-speaking	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	1.5
Foreign-born Negro	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	4.7
Foreign-born White	1	100.0	--	0.0	1	0.8
Asian	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	3.1
T O T A L	49	38.3	79	61.7	128	100.0

TABLE 8

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
AT UNIVERSITY CENTER

Ethnic Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA-born)	73	40.6	107	59.4	180	49.7
Puerto Rican (USA-or PR-born)	88	61.1	56	38.9	144	39.8
White (USA-born)	10	83.3	2	16.7	12	3.3
Other Spanish-speaking	8	61.5	5	38.5	13	3.6
Foreign-born Negro	1	11.1	8	88.9	9	2.5
Foreign-born White	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	1.1
Asian	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
T O T A L	183	50.6	179	49.4	362	100.0

TABLE 10

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY AND EVENING)

Senior College	Negro (USA)		Puerto Rican (USA or PR)		White (USA)		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Brooklyn	164	58.8	50	17.9	33	11.8	32	11.5	279
Day	160	58.8	50	18.4	32	11.8	30	11.0	272
Eve	4	57.1	--	0.0	1	14.3	2	28.6	7
City	146	68.9	34	16.0	13	6.1	19	9.0	212
Hunter	45	48.9	32	34.8	7	7.6	8	8.7	92
Lehman	43	69.4	9	14.5	3	4.8	7	11.3	62
Day	31	67.4	7	15.2	3	6.5	5	10.9	46
Eve	12	75.0	2	12.5	--	0.0	2	12.5	16
Queens	90	67.7	23	17.3	6	4.5	14	10.5	133
Day	86	67.2	23	18.0	6	4.7	13	10.1	128
Eve	4	80.0	--	0.0	--	0.0	1	20.0	5
University Center	180	49.7	144	39.8	12	3.3	26	7.2	362
York	18	62.1	9	31.0	--	0.0	2	6.9	29
T O T A L	686	58.7	301	25.8	74	6.3	108	9.2	1,169

TABLE 9

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
AT YORK COLLEGE

Ethnic Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA-born)	5	27.8	13	72.2	18	62.1
Puerto Rican (USA- or PR-born)	7	77.8	2	22.2	9	31.0
White (USA-born)	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Other Spanish-speaking	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Foreign-born Negro	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Foreign-born White	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Asian	2	100.0	--	0.0	2	6.9
T O T A L	14	48.3	15	51.7	29	100.0

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF USA-BORN NEGROES COMPARED WITH THAT OF **ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)**

Senior College	Negro		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Brooklyn	160	58.8	112	41.2	272
City	146	68.9	66	31.1	212
Hunter	45	48.9	47	51.1	92
Lehman	31	67.4	15	32.6	46
Queens	86	67.2	42	32.8	128
University Center	180	49.7	182	50.3	362
York	18	62.1	11	37.9	29
T O T A L	666	58.4	475	41.6	1,141

$x^2 = 29.97$
$df = 6$
$p < .001$

TABLE 12

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISON BETWEEN USA-BORN NEGROES AND
ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968
ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

	Brooklyn	City	Hunter	Lehman	Queens	University Center	York
Brooklyn	--	5.16*	2.74	1.20	2.57	5.17*	0.11
City	5.16*	--	10.93****	0.03	0.10	19.70****	0.54
Hunter	2.74	10.93****	--	4.23*	7.42	0.02	1.53
Lehman	1.20	0.03	4.23*	--	0.00	5.10*	0.22
Queens	2.57	0.10	7.42***	0.00	--	11.62****	0.28
University Center	5.17*	19.70****	0.02	5.10*	11.62****	--	1.64
York	0.11	0.54	1.53	0.22	0.28	1.64	--

*$p < .05$
***$p < .01$
****$p < .001$

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF PUERTO RICANS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

Senior College	Puerto Rican		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Brooklyn	50	18.4	222	81.6	272
City	34	16.0	178	84.0	212
Hunter	32	34.8	60	65.2	92
Lehman	7	15.2	39	84.8	46
Queens	23	18.0	105	82.0	128
University Center	144	39.8	218	60.2	362
York	9	31.0	20	69.0	29
T O T A L	299	26.2	842	73.8	1,141

$\underline{x}^2 = 65.64$
$\underline{df} = 6$
$\underline{p} < .001$

TABLE 14

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS OF PUERTO RICANS WITH ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

	Brooklyn	City	Hunter	Lehman	Queens	University Center	York
Brooklyn	--	0.46	10.59***	0.27	0.01	33.40****	2.66
City	0.46	--	13.26****	0.02	0.21	35.20****	3.91*
Hunter	10.59***	13.26****	--	5.79**	8.07***	0.77	0.14
Lehman	0.27	0.02	5.79**	--	0.18	10.56***	2.65
Queens	0.01	0.21	8.07***	0.18	--	20.02****	2.49
University Center	33.40****	35.20****	0.77	10.56***	20.02****	--	0.86
York	2.66	3.91*	0.14	2.65	2.49	0.86	--

*p < .05
**p < .02
***p < .01
****p < .001

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF USA-BORN WHITES COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

Senior College	White		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Brooklyn	32	11.8	240	88.2	272
City	13	6.1	199	93.9	212
Hunter	7	7.6	85	92.4	92
Lehman	3	6.5	43	93.5	46
Queens	6	4.7	122	95.3	128
University Center	12	3.3	350	96.7	362
York	--	0.0	29	100.0	29
T O T A L	73	6.4	1,068	93.6	1,141

$\underline{x}^2 = 19.18$
$\underline{df} = 5$
$\underline{p} < .01$

TABLE 16

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS OF USA-BORN WHITES WITH ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

	Brooklyn	City	Hunter	Lehman	Queens	University Center
Brooklyn	--	4.48*	1.24	1.10	5.07*	17.16****
City	4.48*	--	0.23	0.00	0.32	2.55
Hunter	1.24	0.23	--	0.05	0.82	3.37
Lehman	1.10	0.00	0.05	--	0.23	1.19
Queens	5.07*	0.32	0.82	0.23	--	0.50
University Center	17.16****	2.55	3.37	1.19	0.50	--

Note.-- Does not include York College

*$p < .05$
****$p < .001$

TABLE 17

SEX DISTRIBUTION AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY AND EVENING)

Senior College	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Brooklyn	116	41.6	163	58.4	279	23.9
Day	115	42.3	157	57.7	272	23.3
Eve	1	14.3	6	85.7	7	0.6
City	108	50.9	104	49.1	212	18.1
Hunter	25	27.2	67	72.8	92	7.9
Lehman	24	38.7	38	61.3	62	5.3
Day	19	41.3	27	58.7	46	3.9
Eve	5	31.2	11	68.8	16	1.4
Queens	50	37.6	83	62.4	133	11.3
Day	49	38.3	79	61.7	128	10.9
Eve	1	20.0	4	80.0	5	0.4
University Center	183	50.6	179	49.4	362	31.0
York	14	48.3	15	51.7	29	2.5
T O T A L	520	44.5	649	55.5	1,169	100.0

Note.--Chi square computed with day and evening combined

$$\underline{x}^2 = 24.65$$
$$\underline{df} = 6$$
$$\underline{p} < .001$$

TABLE 18

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN SEX DISTRIBUTIONS
AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS
(DAY AND EVENING COMBINED)

	Brooklyn	City	Hunter	Lehman	Queens	University Center	York
Brooklyn	--	4.25*	6.09**	0.17	0.59	5.10	0.48
City	4.25*	--	14.73****	2.88	5.87**	0.01	0.07
Hunter	6.09**	14.73****	--	2.27	2.66	16.15****	4.50*
Lehman	0.17	2.88	2.27	--	0.02	2.97	0.74
Queens	0.59	5.87**	2.66	0.02	--	6.55**	1.14
University Center	5.10*	0.01	16.15****	2.97	6.55**	--	0.06
York	0.48	0.07	4.50*	0.74	1.14	0.06	--

*$p < .05$
**$p < .02$
****$p < .001$

TABLE 19

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF USA-BORN NEGROES AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

Senior College	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Brooklyn	66	41.2	94	58.8	160
City	71	48.6	75	51.4	146
Hunter	10	22.2	35	77.8	45
Lehman	10	32.3	21	67.7	31
Queens	29	33.7	57	66.3	86
University Center	73	40.6	107	59.4	180
York	5	27.8	13	72.2	18
T O T A L	264	39.6	402	60.4	666

$\underline{x}^2 = 13.90$
$\underline{df} = 6$
$\underline{p} < .05$

TABLE 20

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN SEX DISTRIBUTION
OF USA-BORN NEGROES AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968
ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

	Brooklyn	City	Hunter	Lehman	Queens	University Center	York
Brooklyn	--	1.68	5.45**	0.88	1.34	0.02	1.22
City	1.68	--	9.82***	2.76	4.91*	2.13	2.80
Hunter	5.45**	9.82***	--	0.95	1.87	5.20*	0.22
Lehman	0.88	2.76	0.95	--	0.02	0.76	0.11
Queens	1.34	4.91*	1.87	0.02	--	1.15	0.24
University Center	0.02	2.13	5.20*	0.76	1.15	--	1.12
York	1.22	2.80	0.22	0.11	0.24	1.12	--

* $p < .05$
** $p < .02$
*** $p < .01$

TABLE 21

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF PUERTO RICANS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

Senior College	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Brooklyn	10	20.0	40	80.0	50
City	22	64.7	12	35.3	34
Hunter	10	31.2	22	68.8	32
Lehman	3	42.9	4	57.1	7
Queens	10	43.5	13	56.5	23
University Center	88	61.1	56	38.9	144
York	7	77.8	2	22.2	9
T O T A L	150	50.2	149	49.8	299

$\underline{x}^2 = 35.86$
$\underline{df} = 6$
$\underline{p} < .001$

TABLE 22

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN SEX DISTRIBUTIONS OF PUERTO RICANS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

	Brooklyn	City	Hunter	Lehman	Queens	University Center	York
Brooklyn	--	17.15****	1.34	1.82	4.37*	25.09****	12.41****
City	17.15****	--	7.39***	1.16	2.51	0.15	0.55
Hunter	1.34	7.39***	--	0.35	0.86	9.46***	6.27**
Lehman	1.82	1.16	0.35	--	0.00	0.93	2.05
Queens	4.37*	2.51	0.86	0.00	--	2.54	3.06
University Center	25.09****	0.15	9.46***	0.93	2.54	--	1.00
York	12.41****	0.55	6.27**	2.05	3.06	1.00	--

*p .05
**p .02
***p .01
****p ,001

TABLE 23

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF USA-BORN WHITES AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

Senior College	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Brooklyn	23	71.9	9	28.1	32
City	6	46.2	7	53.8	13
Hunter	3	42.9	4	57.1	7
Lehman	2	66.7	1	33.3	3
Queens	3	50.0	3	50.0	6
University Center	10	83.3	2	16.7	12
York	--	0.0	--	0.0	--
T O T A L	47	64.4	26	35.6	73

$\underline{X}^2 = 6.49$
$\underline{df} = 5$
Not Significant

TABLE 24

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA AND HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGE OF STUDENTS AT EACH SENIOR C

Senior College	Academic			General			Vocational			Commercia		
	N	%	H.S.A.	N	%	H.S.A.	N	%	H.S.A.	N	%	H
Brooklyn	125[a]	46.0	75.6	79	29.0	74.0	39	14.3	75.5	24	8.8	
City	86[b]	40.6	74.9	74[f]	34.9	73.6	30	14.2	75.4	18	8.5	
Hunter	40[c]	43.5	74.2	31[g]	33.7	74.1	12	13.0	73.4	8	8.7	
Lehman	34	73.9	74.6	9	19.6	75.7	1	2.2	71.3	1	2.2	
Queens	75[d]	58.6	74.3	27	21.1	73.5	13	10.2	74.5	6	4.7	
University Center	117[e]	32.3	73.7	120[h]	33.2	72.5	70	19.3	75.2	36[i]	9.9	
York	17	58.6	72.8	5	17.2	72.4	5	17.2	72.7	1	3.4	
T O T A L	494	43.3	74.6	345	30.2	73.4	170	14.9	75.0	94	8.2	

Note.-- N reduced by missing information as indicated: High School did not report overal

[a]N = 124
[b]N = 84
[c]N = 39
[d]N = 71
[e]N = 116
[f]N = 69
[g]N = 30
[h]N = 116
[i]N = 35
[j]N = 3
[k]N = 0
[l]N = 2
[m]N = 6

*Percentages may not equal 100.0% because of rounding.

TABLE 24

ERAGE OF STUDENTS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

	Vocational			Commercial			Technical			Equivalency			Total		
A.	N	%	H.S.A.	N	%	H.S.A.	N	%	H.S.A.	N	%	H.S.A.	N	%*	H.S.A.
	39	14.3	75.5	24	8.8	77.2	--	0.0	0.0	5[j]	1.8	71.3	272	99.9	75.2
	30	14.2	75.4	18	8.5	74.8	1	0.5	73.3	3[k]	1.4	0.0	212	100.1	74.5
	12	13.0	73.4	8	8.7	74.5	--	0.0	0.0	1	1.1	79.7	92	100.0	74.1
	1	2.2	71.3	1	2.2	71.3	--	0.0	0.0	1	2.2	59.5	46	100.1	74.3
	13	10.2	74.5	6	4.7	74.1	1	0.8	68.9	6[l]	4.7	73.8	128	100.1	74.1
	70	19.3	75.2	36[i]	9.9	74.8	6	1.7	77.7	13[m]	3.6	62.3	362	100.0	73.6
	5	17.2	72.7	1	3.4	83.6	--	0.0	0.0	1[h]	3.4	0.0	29	99.8	73.1
	170	14.9	75.0	94	8.2	75.4	8	0.7	76.0	30	2.6	67.3	1,141	99.9	74.3

High School did not report overall grade average. Students had received credit but no grade.

TABLE 25

ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

Senior College	Academic		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Brooklyn	125	46.0	147	54.0	272
City	86	40.6	126	59.4	212
Hunter	40	43.5	52	56.5	92
Lehman	34	73.9	12	26.1	46
Queens	75	58.6	53	41.4	128
University Center	117	32.3	245	67.7	362
York	17	58.6	12	41.4	29
T O T A L	494	43.3	647	56.7	1,141

$$x^2 = 51.73$$
$$df = 6$$
$$p < .001$$

TABLE 26

MEAN ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES FOR STUDENTS WITH ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY) AND ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG COLLEGES

Mean Academic High School Averages

Senior College	Mean H.S.A.
Brooklyn	75.6
City	74.9
Hunter	74.2
Lehman	74.6
Queens	74.3
University Center	73.7
York	72.8

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Schools	274.33	6	45.72	0.22
Within Schools	76,933.88	378	203.53	
Total	77,208.31			

$F_{.05}$ (6,378) = 2.12

Not Significant

TABLE 27

MEAN ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES FOR STUDENTS WITH GENERAL DIPLOMAS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE (DAY) AND ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG COLLEGES

Mean Academic School Averages

Senior College	Mean H.S.A.
Brooklyn	74.0
City	73.6
Hunter	74.1
Lehman	75.7
Queens	73.5
University Center	72.5
York	72.4

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Schools	196.16	6	32.69	2.10
Within Schools	5,115.67	328	15.60	
Total	5,311.83			

$F_{.05}$ (6,328) = 2.12

Not Significant

TABLE 28

MEAN ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES FOR STUDENTS HOLDING ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF STUDENTS HOLDING ALL OTHER TYPES OF DIPLOMAS AT EACH SENIOR COLLEGE OF 1968 ENTERING CLASS (DAY)

Senior College	Academic		All Others		Total	
	N	H.S.A.	N	H.S.A.	N	H.S.A.
Brooklyn	125[a]	75.6	147[f]	74.9	272	75.2
City	86[b]	74.9	126[g]	74.3	212	74.5
Hunter	40[c]	74.2	52[h]	74.1	92	74.1
Lehman	34	74.6	12	73.7	46	74.3
Queens	75[d]	74.3	53[i]	73.8	128	74.1
University Center	117[e]	73.7	245[j]	73.5	362	73.6
York	17	72.8	12[k]	73.6	29	73.1
T O T A L	494	74.6	647	74.1	1,141	74.3

Note-- N reduced by missing information as indicated:
High School did not report overall grade average.
Students had received credit but no grade.

[a] N = 124
[b] N = 84
[c] N = 39
[d] N = 71
[e] N = 116
[f] N = 145
[g] N = 118
[h] N = 51
[i] N = 49
[j] N = 233
[k] N = 11